

1 EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
2 Attorney General of the State of California
3 DAVID S. CHANEY
4 Chief Assistant Attorney General
5 ROCHELLE C. EAST
6 Acting Senior Assistant Attorney General
7 JONATHAN L. WOLFF
8 Supervising Deputy Attorney General
9 KYLE A. LEWIS, State Bar No. 201041
10 Deputy Attorney General
11 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
12 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
13 Telephone: (415) 703-5677
14 Fax: (415) 703-5843
15 Email: Kyle.Lewis@doj.ca.gov

9 Attorneys for Defendants James Tilton, Jeanne
10 Woodford, Suzan Hubbard, Anthony P. Kane, Ben
Curry, W. J. Hill, B. Hedrick, and N. Grannis

11

12 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
14 SAN JOSE DIVISION

15 ARMANDO VINCENT MUÑOZ

Plaintiff.

Digitized by srujanika@gmail.com

Case No. C 07-3846 JF

**DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION TO
DISMISS**

JAMES TILTON, et al.,

Defendants.

INTRODUCTION

22 In his Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, Plaintiff argues that his claims should
23 not be dismissed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) because Plaintiff's Complaint
24 meets the threshold requirement for pleadings. Plaintiff also argues that his Complaint should
25 not be dismissed because the Defendants' approved vendor policy violates Plaintiff's rights to
26 freely exercise his religious beliefs. Lastly, Plaintiff contends that Defendants cannot claim
27 qualified immunity from liability for civil damages under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

28 As more thoroughly discussed below, Plaintiff's claims are not sufficiently plead and

Defs.' Reply Supp. Mot. to Dismiss

Munoz v. Tilton, et al.
Case No. C 07-3846 JF

1 should be dismissed. Plaintiff fails to state a claim against Defendants for violation of Plaintiff's
 2 First Amendment right to the free exercise of religion. Plaintiff's allegations against certain
 3 Defendants arising from their role in processing his administrative grievance or promulgation of
 4 prison policies are not sufficiently plead to attach liability to these individuals. Furthermore,
 5 Defendants are entitled to qualified immunity because their conduct was constitutionally valid.
 6 Finally, Plaintiff fails to sufficiently allege the basis for an award of punitive damages, and his
 7 request for this type of damages must be dismissed.

8 **STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

9 Plaintiff is a prisoner in the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
 10 currently incarcerated at the Correctional Training Facility (CTF), located in Soledad, California.
 11 On July 26, 2007, Plaintiff filed this action alleging that Defendants James Tilton, Jeanne
 12 Woodford, Suzan Hubbard, Anthony P. Kane, Ben Curry, W. J. Hill, B. Hedrick, and N. Grannis
 13 (Defendants) violated his First Amendment right to the free exercise of religion by restricting his
 14 possession of religious materials in prison. The action stems from an event that occurred on
 15 September 25, 2006, when personnel working in a mail room at the Correctional Training
 16 Facility withheld a package of compact discs mailed to Plaintiff. (Court Document (CD) # 1 at
 17 3(b).) These compact discs were withheld from Plaintiff because they came from an organization
 18 that was not on the list of approved vendors permitted to deliver materials to inmates in the
 19 custody of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) under
 20 established department and facility operating procedures. (CD # 1 at Ex. A, p. 4.)

21 On May 22, 2008, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss Plaintiff's suit under Federal Rule
 22 of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, for a
 23 determination that Defendants are entitled to qualified immunity, and that Plaintiff's request for
 24 punitive damages is not supported by the allegations of the Complaint. On June 25, 2008,
 25 Plaintiff filed his opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss.^{1/} (CD # 21.)

26
 27 1. Under the Court's Order of Service, Plaintiff's opposition was originally due on June 23,
 28 2008. (CD # 5, at 3.) On June 20, 2008, counsel for Defendants was contacted by the Pacific Justice
 Institute regarding a pending Association of Counsel on behalf of Plaintiff, which was ultimately
 Defendants' Reply Supp. Mot. to Dismiss

ARGUMENT

I.

PLAINTIFF'S ASSERTIONS THAT THE DEFENDANTS' ACTIONS VIOLATE THE RELIGIOUS LAND USE AND INSTITUTIONALIZED PERSONS ACT ARE IMPROPER BECAUSE THE COURT DID NOT FIND A COGNIZABLE CLAIM UNDER THAT LAW UPON SCREENING THE COMPLAINT.

6 In its Order of Service on Plaintiff's complaint, the Court found one cognizable claim--that
7 Defendants allegedly violated Plaintiff's "First Amendment right to the free exercise of religion
8 by restricting his possession of religious materials in prison." (CD # 5, at 2.) The Court did not
9 find that Plaintiff stated a cognizable claim under the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized
10 Persons Act of 2000, 42 U.S.C. § 2000cc (RLUIPA). Thus, any claims by Plaintiff that
11 Defendants denied him the ability to practice his faith in violation of RLUIPA, or that he is
12 entitled to relief under RLUIPA, should not be considered because no such claim exists in this
13 action. (See Pl's Opp'n to Defs' Mot to Dismiss, at 4, 6-8. (CD # 21).

III.

**THE COURT SHOULD DISMISS THE COMPLAINT BECAUSE
DEFENDANTS' ENFORCEMENT OF CDCR POLICY REGARDING
RECEIPT OF MATERIALS FROM APPROVED VENDORS DOES NOT
VIOLATE PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO THE FREE
EXERCISE OF RELIGION.**

18 Defendants moved to dismiss Plaintiff's First Amendment claim because he failed to
19 demonstrate how withholding the CDs under the CDCR policy prevented him from engaging in
20 conduct mandated by his faith. *See Shakur v. Schiro*, 514 F.3d 878, 884 (9th Cir. 2008).
21 Additionally, the CDCR policy to prevent introduction of materials into prisons from non-
22 approved vendors serves a legitimate, reasonable, and constitutional penological interest in
23 ensuring safety at its facilities. *See O'Lone v. Estate of Shabazz*, 482 U.S. 342, 349 (1987);
24 *Turner v. Safley*, 482 U.S. 78, 89 (1987). In his opposition, Plaintiff raises a variety of RLUIPA-
25 based issues regarding the viability of his Complaint but as explained above, the Court did not

27 filed on June 23, 2008. (CD # 20.) As a professional courtesy and in the interests of saving the
28 Court's resources in not having to consider a request for additional time, Defendants' counsel
granted an extension to Plaintiff's counsel to file their opposition on or before June 25, 2008.

1 find a cognizable RLUIPA claim. Furthermore, Plaintiff's argument that his First Amendment
 2 claim is sufficiently plead is unconvincing and denies the legitimate basis for CDCR's approved
 3 vendor policy. For these reasons, Plaintiff's First Amendment claim must be dismissed.

4 **A. Plaintiff Fails to Sufficiently Allege that Receiving Religious CDs is Necessary
 5 for Him to Practice Sincerely Held Beliefs that Are Rooted in His Christian Faith.**

6 Plaintiff claims that Defendants substantially burdened his freedom to exercise his
 7 religious beliefs by denying him access to the CDs delivered to him. In demonstrating the
 8 sincerity of his Christian faith, Plaintiff states that he "sincerely subscribes to Biblical
 9 preferences, as indicated by his refusal to attend religious services that do not preach them" and
 10 that his "beliefs are also religious in nature, as indicated by the multiple scriptural references he
 11 provided in his complaint." (CD # 21 at 8-9.) However, Plaintiff does not make a sufficient
 12 connection between these beliefs and the need to receive the CDs in question. Listening to CDs
 13 containing spoken words or music is one, but not the only, method by which a person practices
 14 his or her religion.

15 Defendants' actions in denying Plaintiff religious CDs do not substantially burden his
 16 ability to practice his Christian faith, rather Plaintiff's actions have. Plaintiff has chosen not to
 17 avail himself of the religious services offered at CTF, claiming that he does not attend the chapel
 18 at the institution due to his religious convictions that the ministry does not function according to
 19 Biblical standards. (CD # 1 at Ex. A, p. 11.) By his own admission, Plaintiff has prevented
 20 himself from hearing the word of God preached for a period of time. (*Id.*) Where Plaintiff,
 21 incarcerated as a result of his actions, refuses to avail himself of the religious programs offered at
 22 a prison facility, he cannot expect absolute access to other forms of religious materials as he may
 23 in the general public. This is a point accepted by Plaintiff in his own opposition--while inmates
 24 maintain their First Amendment rights to the free exercise of their religion, those rights are
 25 necessarily limited by virtue of their incarceration. (CD # 21 at 6, quoting *O'Lone v. Estate of*
 26 *Shabazz*, 482 U.S. 342, 348 (1987).) *Turner v. Safley*, 482 U.S. 78, 89 (1987).) Because he
 27 cannot demonstrate how Defendants have substantially burdened his practice of religion,
 28 Plaintiff's claim should be dismissed.

B. CDCR's Regulations Regarding Receipt of CDs from Approved Vendors Serves Legitimate Penological Interests and Is Constitutionally Valid.

Even if it is shown that prison officials burdened conduct that is mandated by Plaintiff's faith, there is no violation of Plaintiff's First Amendment rights if the restriction imposed by the state was reasonably related to legitimate penological objectives. *O'Lone v. Estate of Shabazz*, 482 U.S. 342, 349 (1987). In order to determine whether a prison regulation is reasonable and constitutional, a four-part test is utilized to weigh the inmate's free exercise right against the state's legitimate penological interests. Where the state can demonstrate those legitimate interests, the regulation is valid. *Turner*, 482 U.S. at 89.

10 In applying the first step of the *Turner* test, Defendants demonstrate that there exists a
11 “valid, rational connection between the prison regulation and the legitimate governmental interest
12 put forward to justify it.” *Id.* at 89. Plaintiff’s opposition acknowledges that Defendants’
13 concerns with respect to safety, security, and efficient operation of prisons “hav[e] some
14 validity.” (CD # 21 at 9-10.) Further, Plaintiff’s citations to *Jesus Christ Prison Ministries v.*
15 *Cal. Dep’t of Corrs.*, 456 F. Supp. 2d 1188 (E.D. Cal. 2006) (*JCPM*), do not address the variety
16 of requirements that approved vendors must comply with in the CDCR policies at issue in the
17 instant case. Plaintiff’s attempts to minimize these requirements, which address legitimate
18 security and licensing concerns and were not raised in the *JCPM* case, ignore a crucial aspect of
19 prison operations. Taken as a whole, the regulations at issue serve the legitimate interest of
20 preventing the introduction of contraband or otherwise unwanted material into prison facilities,
21 including CDs delivered to inmates by non-approved vendors.

22 The second factor of the *Turner* test requires courts to determine whether alternative means
23 of expressing Plaintiff's religion remain available. *Turner*, 482 U.S. at 90. Plaintiff claims that
24 the services and amenities offered by CTF "do not satisfy his hunger for Biblical knowledge."
25 (CD # 21 at 11.) Thus, Plaintiff is claiming that his ability to utilize the chaplain, chapel, and
26 religious library, to receive written religious materials, to congregate with fellow inmates, and to
27 have the unfettered ability to preach the word of God is insufficient for his religious needs. It is
28 difficult to understand how in this multitude of alternative means of expressing one's faith,

1 Plaintiff cannot find his religious sustenance. Moreover, Plaintiff does not adequately
 2 demonstrate how these CDs, purportedly containing sermons and music, will fulfill his religious
 3 needs.

4 Under the third *Turner* factor, courts must consider the impact of an accommodation on
 5 guards, other inmates, and prison resources. *Ward v. Walsh*, 1 F.3d 873, 877 (9th Cir. 1992). In
 6 their moving papers, Defendants noted that creating a special class of religious mail to allow
 7 religious CDs into prisons could lead to a variety of problems at institutions. In his opposition,
 8 Plaintiff states that “Defendants’ favorable-treatment argument might carry more weight in this
 9 case if Plaintiff has not alleged that a Buddhist inmate ‘was already receiving religious . . . CDs
 10 from an outside source.’” (CD # 21 at 13.) However, Plaintiff fails to provide further information
 11 regarding those alleged CDs, including whether the outside source was an approved vendor, when
 12 the CDs were received, or what exactly the CDs contained. Without this information, and even if
 13 accepted in a light most favorable to Plaintiff, such an insufficient allegation regarding the receipt
 14 of a Buddhist CD cannot invalidate Defendants’ contention that the third *Turner* factor weighs in
 15 their favor.

16 Lastly under the *Turner* test, courts must look to whether there is an absence of ready
 17 alternatives which would indicate the regulation’s reasonableness. *Turner*, 482 U.S. at 90. As
 18 stated previously and in Defendants’ moving papers, Plaintiff is provided with ready alternatives
 19 to religious CDs in the form of a functioning chapel, chaplain, chapel library, freedom of
 20 association with fellow inmates, and the ability to request any religious materials in written
 21 format. (CD # 18 at 10.) Furthermore, permitting inmates to receive religious CDs from non-
 22 approved vendors would cause substantial increased costs for Defendants. Because these
 23 materials would not be originating from known vendors whose packaging and security protocols
 24 have been established, Defendants would have to inspect each package received to check for
 25 contraband or disallowed material. This could take substantial time and resources from CDCR
 26 staff, and is unreasonable in light of the religious practice alternatives already available to
 27 inmates.

28 Because all four *Turner* factors weigh in Defendants’ favor, Plaintiff’s First Amendment
 Defs.’ Reply Supp. Mot. to Dismiss

1 claim fails, and this suit must be dismissed.

2 **III.**

3 **PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS AGAINST DEFENDANTS WOODFORD, TILTON,**
 4 **HUBBARD, KANE, CURRY, HILL, AND GRANNIS MUST BE DISMISSED**
 5 **BECAUSE THEY FAIL TO ALLEGE SUFFICIENT FACTS TO SUPPORT**
A THEORY OF SUPERVISOR LIABILITY.

6 Defendants Woodford, Tilton, Hubbard, Kane, Curry, Hill and Grannis moved to dismiss
 7 Plaintiff's claims against them on the grounds that insufficient evidence was provided regarding
 8 their knowledge of or participation in the alleged constitutional violation committed against the
 9 Plaintiff. In his opposition, Plaintiff claims that he specified the role of each named Defendant in
 10 creating, implementing, or enforcing the approved vendor policy that caused Plaintiff's
 11 constitutional deprivation. However, Plaintiff's assertions regarding each Defendant's role were
 12 generalized statements that cannot be the basis for the imposition of supervisor liability under a §
 13 1983 claim. Accordingly, Plaintiff's claims against these certain Defendants must be dismissed.

14 In pleading the alleged roles of Defendants Woodford, Tilton, Hubbard, Kane, and Curry,
 15 Plaintiff states that their "acts and omissions in [implementing or maintaining the CDCR policy
 16 regarding approved vendors] were a substantial factor in violating Plaintiff's right to be free to
 17 exercise his religion guaranteed by the First Amendment." (CD # 1, at 3(e)-(g).) Furthermore, in
 18 pleading the alleged roles of Defendants Hill and Grannis, Plaintiff claimed that they "failed to
 19 take action when they became aware of Plaintiffs' injuries" and "[t]heir omissions were
 20 substantial factors in maintaining the violations of Plaintiff's rights to be free to exercise his
 21 religion guaranteed by the First Amendment." (CD # 1 at 3(g).)

22 However, as was argued in Defendants' moving papers, liability in a § 1983 claim will only
 23 attach to supervisors if they personally participated in an alleged constitutional violation, or had
 24 knowledge that their subordinates were violating another's constitutional rights and did nothing to
 25 prevent it. *Jones v. Williams*, 297 F.3d 930, 934 (9th Cir. 2002). Thus, to bring a successful §
 26 1983 claim against these Defendants, Plaintiff must allege and prove that these Defendants either
 27 personally committed acts which had a direct causal connection to Plaintiff's alleged
 28 constitutional violation, or that these Defendants knew of alleged constitutional violations

1 committed by their subordinates. *Sanders v. Kennedy*, 794 F.2d 478, 483 (9th Cir. 1986).
 2 Plaintiff's complaint fails to allege this causal link, and thus the noted Defendants cannot be held
 3 liable under a theory of supervisor liability.²

4 Plaintiffs's uniform assertion that supervisory Defendant personnel took part in the
 5 enactment and enforcement of one article in the voluminous Departmental Operations Manual is
 6 an insufficient basis upon which to mount a constitutional attack. *See Walker v. Woodford*, 454 F.
 7 Supp. 2d 1007, 1016 (S.D. Cal. 2006) (Senior defendant prison official dismissed from suit where
 8 she neither knew of nor participated in any Constitutional violations). Furthermore, Plaintiff's
 9 allegation that Defendants Hill and Grannis failed to take action when they became aware of
 10 Plaintiff's injuries is a similarly inadequate means to implicate a constitutional violation on their
 11 part. In each instance, Plaintiff fails to make a necessary link between the Defendants' alleged
 12 wrongful conduct and the constitutional violation. Because Plaintiff failed to sufficiently allege
 13 supervisor liability on the part of these Defendants, they should be dismissed from this case.

14 **IV.**

15 **DEFENDANTS ARE ENTITLED TO QUALIFIED IMMUNITY.**

16 In their moving papers, Defendants assert that they are entitled to qualified immunity from
 17 suit because Plaintiff failed to demonstrate the his First Amendment rights were violated and they
 18 acted reasonably in withholding the CDs from Plaintiff based on legitimate penological reasons.
 19 In his opposition, Plaintiff contends that Defendants are not entitled to qualified immunity
 20 because they should have been aware of a court decision allegedly involving similar facts to
 21 Plaintiff's situation. However, as Plaintiff acknowledges, that court decision was specifically

22 2. Plaintiff cites to the decision in *Jesus Christ Prison Ministries v. California Dept. of*
 23 *Corrections*, 456 F. Supp. 2d 1188 (E.D. Cal. 2006), throughout his opposition for support.
 24 However, Plaintiff neglects to acknowledge that in that decision, the court dismissed Defendant
 25 Woodford, who was holding the same position as Director of CDCR at that time. Noting that “[n]o
 26 evidence before the court suggests Director Woodford's personal involvement in the issuing of that
 27 memorandum or in any other changes in mail policies at [the facility],” the court found that
 28 Woodford was not personally involved in imposing the mail policies. *Id.* at 1197. In the instant
 case, Plaintiff fails to demonstrate that Defendants Woodford, Tilton, or Hubbard played a
 significant role in effecting the mail policies at CTF that caused Plaintiff's alleged constitutional
 deprivation.

1 limited in its scope. As such, Defendants are entitled to qualified immunity from suit as it relates
 2 to the alleged violations suffered by Plaintiff.

3 Plaintiff's assertion that Defendants are not entitled to qualified immunity because they
 4 should have been aware of the decision in *Jesus Christ Prison Ministries v. California Dep't of*
 5 *Corrections*, 456 F. Supp. 2d 1188 (E.D. Cal. 2006), is flawed. In his opposition, Plaintiff notes
 6 that the *JCPM* decision was issued three days *after* Plaintiff was not allowed to receive the CDs at
 7 the CTF mail room. (CD # 21 at 18.) Plaintiff also acknowledges that the scope of *JCPM* was
 8 limited to a single prison ministry, three inmate plaintiffs, and one CDCR facility located in the
 9 Eastern District of California. *Id*; *see also JCPM*, 456 F. Supp. 2d at 1195. As discussed below,
 10 these two undisputed facts demonstrate that Defendants are entitled to qualified immunity.

11 First, Plaintiff's own complaint states that Defendants Woodford, Tilton, Hubbard, Kane,
 12 and Curry caused Article 43 of the Department Operations Manual (DOM) to be implemented
 13 between March 2005 and June 2006. (CD # 1 at 3(a)-(b), (f).) Because these dates clearly
 14 precede the issuance of the *JCPM* decision, it is impossible for these Defendants to have known
 15 that, at the time the alleged deprivation of Plaintiff's First Amendment right occurred, their
 16 conduct was unlawful in promulgating the regulation. *See Saucier v. Katz*, 533 U.S. 194, 201–02
 17 (2001.) Second, given that the *JCPM* court specifically limited its application and holding to a
 18 closed universe of persons and facilities, there is no way that Defendants Hedrick, Hill, and
 19 Grannis would have been aware of any potential application the decision had on their processing
 20 of the Plaintiff's administrative grievance. Plaintiff's appeals were resolved less than six months
 21 after the *JCPM* decision (CD # 1 at 3(e)), which plainly stated that the evidence in that case was
 22 not sufficiently developed to encompass all CDCR facilities. *JCPM*, 456 F. Supp. 2d at 1195.
 23 Plaintiff's assertion that this singular result "should have put CDCR and CTF on notice" of a
 24 system-wide issue ignores the decision's own limitations. (CD # 21 at 18.)

25 As discussed in Defendants' motion to dismiss, Plaintiff has not alleged sufficient facts to
 26 support a cognizable legal theory that Defendants violated his First Amendment right to the free
 27 exercise of religion by restricting his possession of religious CDs in prison. Furthermore,
 28 Plaintiff's acknowledgment of the timing and specific holding of the *JCPM* decision demonstrate

1 that Defendants acted as reasonable officials throughout the relevant period. Therefore,
 2 Defendants are entitled to qualified immunity.

3 V.

4 **PLAINTIFF FAILS TO STATE SUFFICIENT FACTS TO SUPPORT
 5 A CLAIM FOR PUNITIVE DAMAGES.**

6 Defendants also moved the Court to dismiss Plaintiff's claim for an award of punitive
 7 damages on the grounds that the complaint fails to allege that Defendants acted with the requisite
 8 evil motive or callous indifference. Plaintiff's opposition does not sufficiently counter this aspect
 9 of Defendants' motion to dismiss, nor does Plaintiff supply additional information justifying
 10 punitive damages against Defendants in either their official or individual capacities. As such,
 11 Plaintiff's request for punitive damages should be dismissed.

12 **CONCLUSION**

13 For the reasons mentioned in this reply brief and in Defendants' moving papers, Defendants
 14 respectfully request that the Court grant their Motion to Dismiss.

15
 16 Dated: July 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

17 EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
 18 Attorney General of the State of California

19 DAVID S. CHANEY
 20 Chief Assistant Attorney General

ROCHELLE C. EAST
 21 Acting Senior Assistant Attorney General

22 JONATHAN L. WOLFF
 23 Supervising Deputy Attorney General

24 /S/ KYLE A. LEWIS

25 KYLE A. LEWIS
 26 Deputy Attorney General
 27 Attorneys for Defendants James Tilton, Jeanne Woodford, Suzan
 Hubbard, Anthony P. Kane, Ben Curry, W. J. Hill, B. Hedrick,
 28 and N. Grannis

ReplyMunoz20122053.wpd
 SF2008401051

27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005
 1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 10010
 10011
 10012
 10013
 10014
 10015
 10016
 10017
 10018
 10019
 10020
 10021
 10022
 10023
 10024
 10025
 10026
 10027
 10028
 10029
 10030
 10031
 10032
 10033
 10034
 10035
 10036
 10037
 10038
 10039
 10040
 10041
 10042
 10043
 10044
 10045
 10046
 10047
 10048
 10049
 10050
 10051
 10052
 10053
 10054
 10055
 10056
 10057
 10058
 10059
 10060
 10061
 10062
 10063
 10064
 10065
 10066
 10067
 10068
 10069
 10070
 10071
 10072
 10073
 10074
 10075
 10076
 10077
 10078
 10079
 10080
 10081
 10082
 10083
 10084
 10085
 10086
 10087
 10088
 10089
 10090
 10091
 10092
 10093
 10094
 10095
 10096
 10097
 10098
 10099
 100100
 100101
 100102
 100103
 100104
 100105
 100106
 100107
 100108
 100109
 100110
 100111
 100112
 100113
 100114
 100115
 100116
 100117
 100118
 100119
 100120
 100121
 100122
 100123
 100124
 100125
 100126
 100127
 100128
 100129
 100130
 100131
 100132
 100133
 100134
 100135
 100136
 100137
 100138
 100139
 100140
 100141
 100142
 100143
 100144
 100145
 100146
 100147
 100148
 100149
 100150
 100151
 100152
 100153
 100154
 100155
 100156
 100157
 100158
 100159
 100160
 100161
 100162
 100163
 100164
 100165
 100166
 100167
 100168
 100169
 100170
 100171
 100172
 100173
 100174
 100175
 100176
 100177
 100178
 100179
 100180
 100181
 100182
 100183
 100184
 100185
 100186
 100187
 100188
 100189
 100190
 100191
 100192
 100193
 100194
 100195
 100196
 100197
 100198
 100199
 100200
 100201
 100202
 100203
 100204
 100205
 100206
 100207
 100208
 100209
 100210
 100211
 100212
 100213
 100214
 100215
 100216
 100217
 100218
 100219
 100220
 100221
 100222
 100223
 100224
 100225
 100226
 100227
 100228
 100229
 100230
 100231
 100232
 100233
 100234
 100235
 100236
 100237
 100238
 100239
 100240
 100241
 100242
 100243
 100244
 100245
 100246
 100247
 100248
 100249
 100250
 100251
 100252
 100253
 100254
 100255
 100256
 100257
 100258
 100259
 100260
 100261
 100262
 100263
 100264
 100265
 100266
 100267
 100268
 100269
 100270
 100271
 100272
 100273
 100274
 100275
 100276
 100277
 100278
 100279
 100280
 100281
 100282
 100283
 100284
 100285
 100286
 100287
 100288
 100289
 100290
 100291
 100292
 100293
 100294
 100295
 100296
 100297
 100298
 100299
 100300
 100301
 100302
 100303
 100304
 100305
 100306
 100307
 100308
 100309
 100310
 100311
 100312
 100313
 100314
 100315
 100316
 100317
 100318
 100319
 100320
 100321
 100322
 100323
 100324
 100325
 100326
 100327
 100328
 100329
 100330
 100331
 100332
 100333
 100334
 100335
 100336
 100337
 100338
 100339
 100340
 100341
 100342
 100343
 100344
 100345
 100346
 100347
 100348
 100349
 100350
 100351
 100352
 100353
 100354
 100355
 100356
 100357
 100358
 100359
 100360
 100361
 100362
 100363
 100364